

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-73 have been examined. Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 15, 17, 19-21, 24, 27-31, 36, 38-40, 46, 49, 54, 56-58, 61, 64, 67, and 72 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16, 18, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28-30, 32-35, 37, 41-45, 47, 48, 50-53, 55, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68-71, and 73 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S.P. 6,064,376 to Berezowski et al.  
("Berezowski")**

Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 15, 17, 19-21, 24, 27-31, 36, 38-40, 46, 49, 54, 56-58, 61, 64, 67, and 72 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Berezowski. Applicant submits that the claims are patentable over the reference.

**A. Claim 1**

Claim 1 states that a first video content having an original size is displayed on a display and that the first video content is reduced in size from the original size and displayed on a first portion of the display in response to at least one command input from a user watching the display. On the other hand, Berezowski does not disclose or suggest the feature above.

For example, while Berezowski discloses various configurations in which program listings 12 and promotional information 14 are displayed on a display, the sizes of the portions of the display 10 containing the listings 12 and the information 14 are set at a cable head end. (See, e.g., Fig. 4; column 4, lines 41-54; and column 5, lines 18-25). Moreover, the cable head end transmits the program listings 12 and the promotional information 14 as a single, combined program on a dedicated television channel (e.g. the Prevue channel), and the display 10 displays

the single combined program. (Column 3, lines 33-37).

Therefore, Berezowski does not suggest reducing the size of the first video content in response to at least one command input from a user watching the display, as recited in claim 1.

**B. Claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 15, and 17**

Since claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 15, and 17 depend upon claim 1, Applicant submits that the claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**C. Claim 19**

Since claim 19 contains features that are similar to the features recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that it is patentable for similar reasons.

**D. Claims 20, 21, 24, 27, 31, and 36**

Since claims 20, 21, 24, 27, 31, and 36 depend upon claim 19, Applicant submits that the claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**E. Claim 38**

Since claim 38 contains features that are similar to the features recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that it is patentable for similar reasons.

**F. Claims 39, 40, 46, 49, and 54**

Since claims 39, 40, 46, 49, and 54 depend upon claim 38, Applicant submits that the claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**G. Claim 56**

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/734,688

Since claim 56 contains features that are similar to the features recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that it is patentable for similar reasons.

**H. Claims 57, 58, 61, 64, 67, and 72**

Since claims 57, 58, 61, 64, 67, and 72 depend upon claim 56, Applicant submits that the claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Berezowski and/or U.S.P. 6,481,010 to Nishikawa et al. (“Nishikawa”)**

Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16, 18, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28-30, 32-35, 37, 41-45, 47, 48, 50-53, 55, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68-71, and 73 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berezowski and/or Nishikawa. Since the above claims depend upon claim 1, 19, 38, or 56 and since Nishikawa does not cure the deficient teachings of Berezowski with respect to claims 1, 19, 38, and 56, Applicant submits that the above claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**III. Newly added claims**

Applicant has added new claims 74-89 to provide more varied protection for the invention.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/734,688

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Grant K. Rowan  
Registration No. 41,278

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 27, 2004